

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adachi (JP401319094). Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi in view of applicant's admitted prior art. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Adachi. Claims 5-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 14-19 are allowed.

**1. Allowable subject Matter:**

Claims 5-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 14-19 are allowed.

**Response:**

The Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the allowance of claims 5-11 if rewritten appropriately. Claim 1 has been amended to contain limitations present in original claims 2 and 5, and is now believed to be allowable by the Examiner. No new material has been introduced. Original claims 2-5 and 12-13 have subsequently been cancelled. Claims 5-11 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, the limitation of *"the impedance device comprises a resistor and a capacitor, the resistor and the capacitor being electrically connected in parallel with each other"* contained in claim 5 has been added to claim 1 along with the limitations of claim 2. Reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested. In addition, claim 6 has been amended to depend on the amended claim 1. As claims 6-11 are dependent on claim 1, they should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 6-11 is respectfully requested. Since the instant application is condition for

allowance, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Applicant also appreciates the Examiner's allowance of claims 14-19.

5

**2. Rejection of claims 1-2 and 4:**

Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adachi (JP401319094).

10        Regarding to claim 1, Adachi discloses a driving circuit of a liquid crystal display device comprising: a substrate (101, Fig. 7); at least two driver integrated circuit (IC) chips (101, 109, Fig. 1) positioned on the substrate; and an impedance device (206, 207, 208, Fig. 3) electrically connected between the two driver IC chips. The impedance device inherently reduces a difference between respective input voltages  
15        being input into the two driver IC chips.

      Regarding to claim 2, Adachi discloses the substrate comprises a plurality of scanning lines (122, Fig. 8) and a plurality of signal lines thereon (119, Figs. 1 and 8).

20        Regarding to claim 4, Adachi discloses the driver IC chips are used for outputting image signals to the signal lines (see Figs. 1 and 8).

**Response:**

      As the above mentioned, claim 1 has been amended to contain limitations present  
25        in original claims 2 and 5 for overcoming the rejection. Because claim 1 is the base claim in the present application and the Examiner has stated that claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, the Applicant believes that the Examiner may now consider all claims in the current application allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and  
30        allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

      Claim 2 has been canceled as specified in the above Listing of Claims section,

and is no longer in need of consideration. Since claim 4 is dependent upon the amended claim 1, it should be allowable if the amended claim 1 is allowable. Reconsideration of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

5     **3. Rejection of claims 3 and 13:**

Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

10     Regarding to claim 3, Adachi does not explicitly disclose connecting driver circuits (driver IC chips) to the scanning lines.

The admitted prior art discloses connecting a plurality of driver IC chips (22, Fig. 1) to a plurality of scanning lines.

15     In light of the admitted prior art, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to connect the IC chips to Adachi's scanning lines because there must be driver circuits for driving the scanning lines.

20     Regarding to claim 13, Adachi does not explicitly disclose the liquid crystal display device is designed by applying wiring on array (WOA) technology.

The admitted prior art discloses a liquid crystal display device is designed by applying wiring on array (WOA) technology to reduce a production cost [0008].

25     In light of the admitted prior art, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to connect the wiring on array (WOA) technology on Adachi's liquid crystal display device to reduce a production cost.

**Response:**

30     Claim 1 has been amended to contain limitations present in original claims 2 and 5 for overcoming the rejection. Neither Adachi nor the prior art teaches that *the impedance device comprises a resistor and a capacitor, and that the resistor and the*

capacitor are electrically connected in parallel with each other, so the amended claim 1 should be allowable in consideration of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Accordingly, since claims 3 and 13 are dependent upon the amended claim 1, they should be allowable if the amended claim 1 is allowable. Reconsideration of claims 3 and 13 is respectfully requested.

#### 4. Rejection of claim 12:

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adachi.

Adachi further discloses a conductive layer is positioned between each of the driver IC chips and the impedance device (see connections in Fig. 3), each of the driver IC chips being capable of receiving an approximately identical input voltage through each of the transparent conductive layers. Adachi does not disclose the conductive layer is transparent. However, it is considered a matter of obvious design choice to make Adachi's conductive layer transparent because this does not provide any unexpected result.

#### Response:

As mentioned above, Adachi did not disclose that *the impedance device comprises a resistor and a capacitor, and that the resistor and the capacitor are electrically connected in parallel with each other*, so the amended claim 1 should be allowable in consideration of Adachi's disclosure. Since claim 12 is dependent upon the amended claim 1, it should be allowable if the amended claim 1 is allowable. Reconsideration of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,



Date: 02/16/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)